	Case 2:20-cv-01958-KJM-JDP Documen	nt 20 Filed 08/17/21 Page 1 of 2
1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
9	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10		
11	JERRY DANIEL PROFFITT,	No. 2:20-cv-01958-KJM-JDP (HC)
12	Petitioner,	
13	V.	<u>ORDER</u>
14	PATRICK COVELLO,	
15	Respondent.	
16		
17	Petitioner, a state prisoner proceeding pro se, has filed an application for a writ of habeas	
18	corpus under 28 U.S.C. § 2254. The matter was referred to a United States Magistrate Judge as	
19	provided by 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302.	
20	On December 14, 2020, the magistrate judge filed findings and recommendations, which	
21	were served on petitioner and which contained notice to petitioner that any objections to the	
22	findings and recommendations were to be filed within fourteen days. ECF No. 15. Petitioner has	
23	filed objections to the findings and recommendations. ECF No. 19.	
24	In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C) and Local Rule 304, this	
25	court has conducted a de novo review of this case. Having reviewed the file, the court does not	
26	adopt the magistrate judge's findings and recommendations, and instead dismisses the petition on	
27	other grounds.	
28		
		1

Case 2:20-cv-01958-KJM-JDP Document 20 Filed 08/17/21 Page 2 of 2

Proffitt is not a first-time habeas petitioner. Proffitt previously sought relief from his conviction and sentence in a petition that was dismissed, with prejudice, as barred by the statute of limitations. *See Proffitt v. Campbell*, 2:06-cv-02143-GEB-GGH (E.D.Cal.). Petitioner continues to file habeas petitions despite this prior dismissal; a scan of this court's docket reveals at least twelve habeas corpus petitions. *See e.g., Proffitt v. Covello*, 2:20-cv-02433-TLN-GGH (dismissing petitioner's habeas claims as second or successive).

Before a federal district court may entertain a claim in a second or successive petition, the petitioner must obtain permission from the appellate court. 28 U.S.C. § 2244(b)(3)(A). A petition is second or successive if it includes a claim that was or could have been adjudicated on the merits in an original petition. *Cooper v. Calderon*, 274 F.3d 1270, 1273 (9th Cir. 2001). Petitioner has not shown the appellate court provided permission for him to pursue a second or successive petition, and therefore his writ of habeas corpus must be dismissed.

Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

- 1. The petition for writ of habeas corpus is dismissed;
- 2. The Clerk of Court close this case; and
- 3. The court declines to issue the certificate of appealability referenced in 28 U.S.C.

17 § 2253.

DATED: August 16, 2021.